Integrated structure investigation in complex networks by label propagation

Tao Wu[a,b,d,*], Yuxiao Guo[a], Leiting Chen[a,b,d], Yanbing Liu[c]

[a] *School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China*
[b] *Institute of Electronic and Information Engineering in Dongguan, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China*
[c] *Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Chongqing 400065, China*
[d] *Digital Media Technology Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province, Chengdu 611731, China*

arXiv:1409.0205v2 [cs.SI] 29 Dec 2015

Abstract

The investigation of network structure has important significance to understand the functions of various complex networks. The communities with hierarchical and overlapping structures and the special nodes like hubs and outliers are all common structure features to the networks. Network structure investigation has attracted considerable research effort recently. However, existing studies have only partially explored the structure features. In this paper, a label propagation based integrated network structure investigation algorithm (LINSIA) is proposed. The main novelty here is that LINSIA can uncover hierarchical and overlapping communities, as well as hubs and outliers. Moreover, LINSIA can provide insight into the label propagation mechanism and propose a parameter-free solution that requires no prior knowledge. In addition, LINSIA can give out a soft-partitioning result and depict the degree of overlapping nodes belonging to each relevant community. The proposed algorithm is validated on various synthetic and real-world networks. Experimental results demonstrate that the algorithm outperforms several state-of-the-art methods.

Keywords: Hierarchical and overlapping community, Hubs and outliers, Label propagation

1. Introduction

Complex networks provide a way to represent complex systems of interacting objects, where nodes denote the objects and edges describe the interactions between them. For example, in ecological systems, nodes represent lives and edges represent dependencies, and in protein association networks, nodes represent proteins and edges represent physical interactions. Common sense dictates that the network structure is characterized by at least three common features: communities, hubs and outliers. Network communities are often correspond to groups of nodes that share a common property, role or function. The nodes within one community are more likely to interact to each other than to the rest of the network. Community structure allows for understanding the network functions that cannot be studied when considering only individual object or the entire system. Moreover, hubs are the nodes that bridge multiple communities, and hubs identification is crucial to network exploration. For example, hubs in epidemiology network could be the nodes that spread epidemics across groups, and immunizing the hubs could help to prevent the spread of epidemics. In addition, the identification of outliers that are marginally connected with the community members is also crucial to networks, as they can be used for abnormal nodes detection in complex networks. The network structure investigation is an important aspect of complex networks research.

In the issue of network structure investigation, early work mainly focused on the community detection in naive networks (non-hierarchical and non-overlapping structures). Many classical methods have been proposed to detect the community structure of complex networks, including division methods [1,2], agglomerative methods [3,4], matrix related methods (non-negative matrix factorization [5], spectral method [6]), model-based methods (label propagation methods [7,8], mixture models [9], stochastic block models [10,11]), etc. In a word, the traditional detection problem about the community structure in naive networks is likely to be properly solved in the last decade.

However, the problem of community detection becomes much harder for the networks with complex communities where hierarchical and overlapping structures emerge at the same time and tangle with each other. In real-world networks, communities are always nested, and the networks exhibit hierarchical community structure, such as the organization of a large company. Moreover, to use a social metaphor, common sense goes that people can belong to different social communities, depending on their friends, professions, hobbies, etc. In network terms, each node

*Corresponding author
Email address: wutaoadeny@gmail.com (Tao Wu)

can be shared between communities, forming overlapping communities. Thus, the networks demand methods that are able to detect complex community with hierarchical and overlapping structures. So later work paid close attention to the community detection in hierarchical and overlapping cases, which generally includes two main genres: hierarchical community detection [12-14] and overlapping community detection [15-22], although several researchers made a pioneering attempt on hierarchical and overlapping community detection [23-25].

Based on the above discussion, most of the existing methods detect community by considering the hierarchical and overlapping structures separately, and there are few integrated algorithms for hierarchical and overlapping community detection. Meanwhile, in the issue of network structure investigation, there are few methods focusing on hubs and outliers identification, although hubs and outliers are important, common features of complex networks. Thus, network structure investigation should also take hubs and outliers identification under consideration. Therefore, how to discover the hierarchical and overlapping communities, hubs and outliers comprehensively and efficiently remains a important task to date.

To better capture the network structures, an intuitive idea is that one should analyze networks in a local view. Thus the computation of the community memberships and the roles of each node can be based only on local information, which can avoid the complex organizational structures with a variety of properties. In this paper, we develop a label propagation based integrated network structure investigation algorithm (LINSIA). The basic idea behind LINSIA is that there has a network topology related equilibrium state between the nodes' community label choices, and the reasonable structure division can be derived based on the label equilibrium state. LINSIA controls the label propagation process to discover multi-scale communities at different aggregation levels, and a community on a large scale corresponds to multiple underlying communities. The main contributions include: (1) LINSIA can reveal hierarchical and overlapping communities, as well as hubs and outliers; (2) LINSIA can provide insight into the label propagation mechanism and propose a parameter-free solution that requires no prior knowledge; (3) LINSIA can give out a soft-partitioning result and depict the degree of overlapping nodes belonging to each relevant community. Experimental results demonstrate that the algorithm outperforms several state-of-the-art methods.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces some influence measures. Section 3 proposes a new label propagation strategy. Section 4 presents the LINSIA algorithm. Our algorithm is tested on a diverse set of networks in Section 5. Discussion and Conclusion are given in Section 6.

2. ENCoreness based influence measures

Before we proceed, it is worthwhile to introduce some necessary definitions for LINSIA. The node influence represents node importance in the full network, and the label influence measures the popularity of each community label in label voting process. The node influence and the label influence are all regulated by an adaptive variable α. In order to compute node importance accurately, node influence should consider node's global role and its local topology information comprehensively. Thus, it exploits extended neighborhood coreness (ENCoreness) centrality [26] to measure node's global importance and includes node degree to capture node's local topology.

Definition 2.1 (Node Influence)**.** Let $NI(i)$ indicates the influence of node i, and it is defined as

$$NI(i) = ENCoreness(i) + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \frac{ENCoreness(j)}{degree(j)^{\alpha}} * w_{i,j} \tag{1}$$

where $ENCoreness(i)$ is the ENCoreness centrality of node i, $degree(j)$ is the degree of node j, $w_{i,j}$ is the weight of edge $e_{i,j}$, $N(i)$ is the neighbor set of node i, and α is an adaptive real variable. The term $\frac{1}{degree(j)^{\alpha}}$ is called normalization factor, which is used to consider the different influences of nodes with diverse degrees.

For the purpose of label selection, we define node i's candidate label set LC_i as the union of neighbor nodes' label sets and let $Lset_j$ denote the label set of node j. Then, we let neighbors vote for each community label in the candidate label set LC_i and use the voting support rate as the label influence. The detailed definition is presented as follows.

Definition 2.2 (Label Influence)**.** Let $LIset_i$ is the label influence set of the labels in the candidate label set LC_i, and it is defined as

$$LIset_i = \{LI_i^p | LI_i^p = \sum_{j \in N(i), q \in Lset_j} \delta(p,q) * \frac{NI(j)}{degree(j)^{\alpha}} * \frac{LI_j^q}{\sum_{m \in Lset_j} LI_j^m} * w_{i,j}, p \in LC_i\} \tag{2}$$

where LI_i^p is the influence of label p on node i, function $\delta(p,q)$ takes value 1 if p is identical to q and 0 otherwise. Other notations mean the same thing as the notations in Eq. (1). The term $\frac{LI_j^q}{\sum_{m \in Lset_j} LI_j^m}$ is the label influence ratio

of label q to the all labels of node j, which denotes the degree of node j belonging to the community with label q. For the iterative updating of the label influence, all nodes are assigned a unique label initially, and they have the same initial label influence.

Why do LINSIA needs the variable α? Variable α balances the cohesion inside the community and the competition between communities, and it is related to the equilibrium state between nodes' community label choices. If setting a small value to variable α, the node influence and label influence of the core nodes will be much greater than that of the periphery nodes (because the ENCoreness values of the core nodes are always bigger than that of the periphery nodes). In this way, the nodes connected with a few core nodes and many periphery nodes will have same community labels as the core nodes rather than the periphery nodes. The way things are going, perhaps all nodes tend to a common label choice. Reversely, if the value of variable α is large, all nodes may tend to a unique label choice. So variable α should be determined based on the network topology by self-adaption.

In LINSIA, we assume that α equals to 1.0 initially, and we compute the total sum of node influence firstly. Then we get the cumulative sum of node influence sequentially in descending order of k-shell value [27] until the cumulative sum equals to half of the total. The ratio r of the number of nodes corresponding to the cumulative sum to the total number of nodes can be viewed as an indicator of imbalance degree of influence distributed among network nodes. To the networks with completely balanced influence distribution, the ratio r takes value of 0.5. To the networks with extremely imbalanced influence distribution, we assume that at least top ten percent of nodes are needed to have half of the total influence. That is say, we assume the ratio r takes value of 0.1 in extremely imbalanced networks. So the median value of the ratio is 0.3. Therefore, the value of the variable α is depend on a function $F(0.3, 1.0, r)$. Thus the variable α is self-adaptive and generally takes values over an interval of real number $(0.4, 1.6)$ in networks with different influence distribution. Then LINSIA computes the normalize factor value and regulates the label selection behavior to make the label updating converge to the equilibrium state. The detailed definition is presented as follows.

Definition 2.3 (Adaptive Variable)**.** The adaptive variable α is defined as

$$\alpha = 1.0 + (0.3 - \frac{N^{'}}{N})^{1/3} \tag{3}$$

where N is the total number of network nodes, and $N^{'}$ is the number of nodes conresponding to the cumulative sum in the above discussion.

3. Label propagation strategy

3.1. Label selection and hubs

According to Eq. (2), in non-overlapping networks, we select the label with the greatest label influence in $LIset_i$ as node i's community label. In overlapping networks, we amplify each label influence in $LIset_i$ of node i, and select the label whose influence has the same order of magnitude with the greatest influence in $LIset_i$ as one of its labels, defined by Eq. (4).

$$Lset_i = \{p | \log(\max(LIset_i))^3 - 1 < \log(LI_i^p)^3 < \log(\max(LIset_i))^3, for LI_i^p \in LIset_i\} \tag{4}$$

If node i's label set $Lset_i$ has more than one label, we define the node as hub node. The formal definition of hubs is presented as follows

$$Hubs = \{i | len(Lset_i) \geq 1, for\ i \in V\} \tag{5}$$

where $len(Lset_i)$ is the number of the labels of node i, and V is the node set of the network.

3.2. Label propagation strategy and outliers

As nodes' label updating depend more on the core nodes' community labels than that of the periphery nodes, accurate label selection of the core nodes is crucial to efficient network structure analysis, which requires updating node labels in ascending order of node influence. Otherwise, inaccurate labels of the core nodes will propagate to the full network and disturb the other nodes' label selection. Moreover, outliers are the nodes that have negligible connection with communities, and they might not participate in any community. Namely, only the nodes with small node degree and independent community label are meaningful to outliers detection. According to the common sense, the nodes with these features are generally the periphery nodes. Therefore, the labels of the periphery nodes with low node influence should be updated preferentially to strive for the independent community label and the equilibrium

state between the label choices of the core nodes and the periphery nodes. Thus, we sort nodes according to their node influence values and update labels in a particular order, i.e., from a low influence to a high influence.

Based on the above analysis, we can find that outliers detection will benefit greatly from updating labels in ascending order. The formal definition of outliers is presented as follows

$$Outliers = \{i | len(Lset_i) == 1 \ \& \ degree(i) \leq 2 \ \& \ \phi(label_i, \ Inlset_i) == 1, \ for \ i \in V\} \tag{6}$$

where $len(Lset_i)$ is the number of the labels of node i, $label_i$ is the community label of node i, $Inlset_i$ is the set of initial labels of node i's neighbors and its own, and $\phi(label_i, \ Inlset_i)$ equals to 1, if $label_i$ is identical to one of the labels in $Inlset_i$.

3.3. Participation intensity

In overlapping networks, to represent the correlation degree of overlapping node to each community, the community detection result and the label influence are used to define participation intensity set

$$PIntensitySet_i = \{PI_i^q | PI_i^q = \frac{LI_i^q}{\sum\limits_{m \in Lset_i} LI_i^m}, q \in Lset_i\} \tag{7}$$

where PI_i^q is the intensity of node i participating in the community with label q.

4. Description of the algorithm

4.1. Algorithm LINSIA

In real-world networks, communities at one level are always nested into communities at an upper level, and the networks exhibit hierarchical community structure. Based on the label selection mechanism and the label propagation strategy defined in section 3, LINSIA constructs a weighted bottom-up super-network structure to detect the hierarchical relationship between the communities. The first step is to detect communities in primitive network and build a weighted super-network by replacing the communities with super-nodes. If the community information is known, it builds a weighted super-network based on the communities directly. The second step is to find non-overlapping communities in the super-network, and mapping the communities to the primitive network to merge the communities detected in the first step. LINSIA executes the last two steps iteratively until the community structure no longer changes. The construction process is illustrated by Fig. 1(a). In the super-network, the edge's weight is defined by

$$w_{i,j} = \sum_{m \in com_i, n \in com_j} \frac{a_{m,n}/len(C_m) \cdot len(C_n)}{N_{i,j}} \tag{8}$$

where com_i is the node set of the community corresponding to the super-node i, $a_{m,n}$ is the element of the primitive network's adjacency matrix, $len(C_m)$ is the number of communities to which node m related, and $N_{i,j}$ is the number of the nodes in com_i and com_j that have edge connecting the communities.

With the super-network structure, LINSIA can find multi-scale communities at different aggregation levels. Here a large-scale community at a high level corresponds to multiple small-scale communities at a a low level, which reflects the hierarchical relationship between the communities in real-world networks. LINSIA returns the hierarchical community structure and the best community division with the greatest modularity Q [4] or extended modularity EQ [24]. Based on the results, LINSIA gets hubs and outliers according to Eq. (5) and Eq. (6). The process of LINSIA is illustrated in Fig. 1 and the pseudo-code is presented in Algorithm 1.

4.2. Initial label influence and adaptive variable

In the iterative updating of label influence, all node labels have the same initial influence. Generally, because the label updating is based on the label influence ratio, the initialized values would not influence the label selection result. Fig. 2(a) plots the finding number of communities with different initial label influence from 1 to 5 on two synthetic networks with different real community number. From this plot, we can see that LINSIA allows yielding stable community partitioning with the initial label influence on different values. So LINSIA is not sensitive to the initial label influence.

Next, we study the influence of the variable α on the number of communities, and plots the result in Fig. 2(b) with α ranging from 0.5 to 1.5 on a synthetic network with community information. From this plot, we can see that the Eq. (3) gives a pretty well estimation to the value of the variable α corresponding to the real community number. So the definition in Eq. (3) is effective for LINSIA.



Fig. 1. The illustration of LINSIA. (a) The construction process of the bottom-up super-network structure. (b) The hierarchical community structure of the network. (c) The final network structure division, which includes 4 communities, 3 hubs and 2 outliers.



(a) Initial label influence vs. community number.

(b) Adaptive variable α vs. community number.

Fig. 2. The sensitivity of initial label influence and adaptive variable α on community detection.

4.3. Computational complexity

The total complexity of LINSIA is the sum of the complexity of community detection at all aggregation levels and the complexity of hubs and outlier identification. The complexity of community detection at one aggregation level is $O(n) + O(n \cdot log(n)) + O(t \cdot m)$, where n and m are the number of the nodes and the edges in the network respectively, $O(n)$ is the complexity of computing node influence, $O(n \cdot log(n))$ is the complexity of node ordering, $O(t \cdot m)$ is the complexity of updating community labels, and t is the number of iterations of label propagation process. If there are h layers in the bottom-up super-network structure, the total complexity of community detection is the sum of the complexities at the aggregation levels corresponding to the h layers. In addition, the complexity of hubs and outlier identification is $O(n)$. Experiments show that t and h are usually small numbers and the number of nodes and edges reduces rapidly as the number of the layers increases.

Algorithm 1 LINSIA algorithm

Input: Network $G = (V, E)$, $V = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n\}$.

Output: Community division set $Dic = \{CS_1, CS_2, ...\}$, the best community division $CS_{best} = \{C_1, C_2, ...\}$, participation intensity $PIntensitySet_i$, and the set of hubs and outliers.

1: $t \leftarrow 0$, and assigning a unique label to each node.

2: $t \leftarrow t + 1$, and find initial community division CS_t.
(a) Compute $NI(i)$ using (1). Arrange nodes in ascending order of node influence, and store the nodes in vector $NList$.
(b) For each node $v_i \in NList$, update its labels according to (2) and (4).
(c) Repeat (b) until node labels do not change any more. Then, get initial community division $CS_t = \{C_1, C_2, ...\}$ according to node labels and $Dic[t] \leftarrow CS_t$.

3: Find community division set $Dic = \{CS_1, CS_2, ...\}$.
(a) Build weighted super-network SN_t based on CS_t using (8), then detect non-overlapping community detection on SN_t and get community division CCS_t in super-network.
(b) $t \leftarrow t+1$, and project CCS_t into primitive network to get the merged community division $CS_t = \{C_1, C_2, ...\}$, then $Dic[t] \leftarrow CS_t$.
(c) Iterate the last two steps until the community division no longer changes.

4: Evaluate the divisions in $Dic = \{CS_1, CS_2, ...\}$. Then copy the division CS_i with the greatest measure value to CS_{best}, and copy the underlying division with the second-greatest measure value to CS_{subc}.

5: Find the set of hubs and outliers based on CS_{best} using (5) and (6), and compute $PIntensitySet_i$ using (7).

6: Return CS_{best}, CS_{subc}, $PIntensitySet_i$, and the set of hubs and outliers.

5. Experimental results

In this section, to demonstrate the benefits of the proposed algorithm LINSIA, we apply it on synthetic networks and real-world networks.

Selection of comparison methods. To evaluate the performance of LINSIA, we compare it to several representatives of community detection algorithms.

LPA [7] and **NIBLPA** [8] are label propagation based algorithms that use network structure alone as their guide and require neither optimization of a pre-defined objective function nor prior information about communities.

Newman Fast Algorithm (NF) [3] is a popular community detection algorithm, which constructs a "dendrogram" by repeatedly joining communities together in pairs based on the greatest increase (or smallest decrease) in modularity measure and cuts through the dendrogram at different levels to give divisions of networks.

Louvain [12] is a well-known modularity based algorithm. It allows for hierarchical community detection and has low time complexity.

OCSBM [22] is an overlapping community detection method based on a principled statistical approach using generative networks models.

EAGLE [24] deals with a set maximal cliques and adopts an agglomerative framework. It aims to detect both the hierarchical and overlapping structures of complex community together.

To evaluate the performance of LINSIA, we compare LINSIA with LPA and NIBLPA to test its capability of community detection in naive networks (non-overlapping and non-hierarchical structures). Then we compare LINSIA with NF and Louvain for hierarchical community detection, and we compare LINSIA with OCSBM for overlapping community detection. Finally, we compare LINSIA with EAGLE in the detection of hierarchical and overlapping communities. For all experiments, we set the initial label influence to 1.0 for LINSIA as the default value, and we set α to 0.5 for NIBLPA.

Evaluation metrics. To extensively compare different community detection algorithms with respect to effectiveness, we evaluate the division results in two ways.

(a) Networks with class label. If community information is already known, the normalized mutual information NMI [28] and ENMI [29] are used to measure the performance of LINSIA for disjoint community detection and overlapping community detection respectively. NMI is proposed to provide a indication of the shared information between a pair of clusterings and ENMI is the extension of NMI for the similarity quantification of the set of true clusters and the set of detected clusters by taking overlapping nodes under consideration.

(b) Networks without class label. Since the ground-truths are unknown, the modularity Q [4] and extended modularity EQ [24] are used to evaluate the quality of the disjoint communities and the overlapping communities. Modularity Q is proposed to quantify the community structure in a network corresponds to a statistically surprising arrangement of edges and EQ is the extension of Q for the goodness evaluation of overlapped community decomposition.

Table 1. Parameters of synthetic networks.

Network	n	k	μ	O_n	O_m	μ'
LRF_1	200	4	0.05	0	0	-
LRF_2	2000	4	0.05	0	0	-
LRF_3	500	4	0.05	0	0	0.30
LRF_4	1000	5	0.05	0	0	0.20
LRF_5	200	3.6	0.05	8	3	-
LRF_6	2000	3.6	0.05	30	4	-
LRF_7	1000	5	0.05	10	3	0.20

Table 2. Analysis of synthetic networks.

Algorithms	LRF_1	LRF_2	LRF_3	LRF_4	LRF_5	LRF_6	LRF_7
	NMI				ENMI		
LPA	0.7102	0.6843	-	-	-	-	-
NIBLPA	0.7213	0.7001	-	-	-	-	-
NF	-	-	0.7140	0.6210	-	-	-
Louvain	-	-	0.7260	0.6426	-	-	-
OCSBM	-	-	-	-	0.9114	0.9311	-
EAGLE	-	-	-	-	0.5017	0.4812	0.4632
LINSIA	0.9365	0.8921	0.8144	0.8829	0.9110	0.9056	0.8090

Table 3. Real-world networks.

Network	Nodes	Edges	Communities
Karate [31]	34	78	2
Dolphins [32]	62	159	2
Football [1]	115	615	12
Polblog [33]	1266	20171	2
Cond [34]	16725	44619	-
Enron [35]	36692	367662	-
Facebook [36]	60000	1545686	-
Flickr [37]	105938	2316948	-



Fig. 3. Hubs and outliers identification test.

5.1. Synthetic networks

In this section, we generate several synthetic networks based on LFR benchmark networks [30] to evaluate the performance of LINSIA. There are many parameters to control the generated networks, including the number of nodes n, the average node degree k, the mixing ratio μ (each vertex shares a fraction μ of its edges with nodes in other communities), the number of overlapped nodes O_n, and the number of memberships of each overlapped node O_m. In addition, parameter μ' is used to denote the mixing ratio for the communities at the high level in networks with hierarchical structures. In our experiments, LRF_1 and LRF_2 are naive synthetic networks, LRF_3 and LRF_4 are synthetic networks with hierarchical structures, LRF_5 and LRF_6 are synthetic networks with overlapping structures, and LRF_7 is a synthetic network with overlapping and hierarchical structures. The parameters for the networks are listed in Table 1.

The results of the methods on the synthetic networks are shown in Table 2. We can see that LPA and NIBLPA can detect satisfactory community divisions in the naive network LRF 1 and LRF 2. Meanwhile, NF and Louvain yield acceptable results for the network LRF 3 and LRF 4. OCSBM almost achieves the perfect community divisions given the number of communities on the network LRF 5 and LRF 6. Although EAGLE allows for hierarchical and overlapping community detection, its accuracy in the network LRF 5, LRF 6 and LRF 7 is low. By contrast, LINSIA can find communities which almost exactly match the ground-truths on all the networks. So LINSIA is competitive with the other methods in the synthetic networks.

In addition, we design a synthetic network to test the capability of LINSIA on hubs and outliers identification. The result is shown in Fig. 3, in which the nodes with the same community label are rendered by the same color. The result shows that the hub node (in red color) serves as a bridge between the nodes with different community label, and the outlier node (in pink color) is marginally connected with a community (in yellow color). So LINSIA can find rational hubs and outliers in the synthetic network.

5.2. Real-world networks

In this section, we conduct experiments on a wide range of real-world networks shown in Table 3. In order to sufficiently evaluate LINSIA's performance, we first test it in terms of non-overlapping and non-hierarchical community detection, hierarchical community detection, overlapping community detection and overlapping and hierarchical community detection. Then we test it for hubs and outliers identification. Moreover, in addition to measuring the results with evaluation metrics, we provide the results of LINSIA on several real-world networks in visual graphics to demonstrate LINSIA's capability of community, hubs and outliers detection.

(1) Non-overlapping and non-hierarchical community detection

We compare our algorithm with LPA, NIBLPA for non-overlapping and non-hierarchical community detection, and Table 4 shows the results of the methods. We can see that LINSIA gets a better result than LPA and NIBLPA.

Table 4. The performance of different algorithms for non-overlapping and non-hierarchical community detection.

Algorithm	Karate	Dolphins	Football	Polblog	Cond	Enron	Facebook	Flicker
	#C, NMI				#C, Q			
LPA	2, 0.7502	6, 0.5845	8, 0.6832	8, 0.4281	1377, 0.6996	2256, 0.2597	786, 0.4327	85, 0.5541
NIBLPA	**2, 0.7655**	**3, 0.7836**	9, 0.7027	8, 0.4432	3222, 0.6578	3363, 0.2093	1344, 0.3981	130, 0.4806
LINSIA	2, 0.7138	4, 0.6795	**11, 0.7411**	**2, 0.7312**	**1021, 0.7676**	**4281, 0.3550**	**1037, 0.4357**	**111, 0.6168**

* The modularity corresponding to LPA is the maximum value of the multiple test results.



Fig. 4. Result of LINSIA on Football network.

Moreover, we find that LPA is a parameterized method and it gets different community divisions on the same network, which is inapplicable in practical problems. It is easy to understand that LINSIA outperforms LPA and NIBLPA since LINSIA improves the traditional method in terms of influence definition, label propagation and label selection. Below we analyze one of the networks in detail. The American College Football network is the network of games between Division IA colleges. There are 115 teams and 12 different conferences except for 8 independent teams. Fig. 4 plots the communities which are detected by LINSIA. It is interesting to note that LINSIA automatically finds 11 strong sense communities with NMI 0.7411. From this figure, we can observe that most of the teams are correctly assigned into corresponding communities. For LPA and NIBLPA, however, they are difficult to discover the natural community structure, and the NMI values are 0.6832 and 0.7027 respectively.

(2) Hierarchical community detection

To evaluate the performance of our algorithm on hierarchical community detection, we compare LINSIA with NF and Louvain, and the results are shown in Table 5. For the labeled networks, we present the numbers and the NMI values of the macro communities at the high level of the hierarchical community structures. For networks without class information, we compute the average Q of the communities of the hierarchical community structure. Table 5 shows that LINSIA achieves a good performance. However, Louvain results in a relatively low values of NMI, and the performance of NF is a bit worse. It is not surprise that LINSIA outperforms NF and Louvain since LINSIA can propagate local labels iteratively, and it can consider label information about the full network to achieve global optimal solution in each label selection. By contrast, NF and Louvain do not have similar mechanism to provide structure information of the full network for individual decision, which may leads to locally optimal solution.

Table 5. The performance of different algorithms for hierarchical community detection.

Algorithm	Karate	Dolphins	Football	Polblog	Cond	Enron	Facebook	Flicker
	#C, NMI of the macroscopical division				Average modularity Q of the hierarchical structure			
NF	**2, 0.7500**	**3, 0.7514**	6, 0.6991	8, 0.4204	0.6011	0.3531	0.5027	0.5545
Louvain	4, 0.5070	5, 0.7011	9, 0.6822	12, 0.3927	0.6712	**0.3673**	**0.5431**	0.6406
LINSIA	2, 0.7138	4, 0.6795	**11, 0.7411**	**2, 0.7312**	**0.7793**	0.3601	0.4863	**0.6668**

Table 6. The performance of different algorithms for overlapping community detection.

Algorithm	Karate	Dolphins	Football	Polblog	Cond	Enron	Facebook	Flicker
	#C, EQ				#C, EQ			
OCSBM	**2, 0.4141**	**2, 0.4562**	**12, 0.6654**	2, 0.4243	-	-	-	-
LINSIA	2, 0.3814	4, 0.3314	10, 0.5887	**2, 0.4253**	**866, 0.7785**	**2644, 0.3567**	**965, 0.4034**	**121, 0.6623**



Fig. 5. Result of LINSIA on Polblog network.

(3) Overlapping community detection

We compare LINSIA with OCSBM to demonstrate the capability of LINISA on overlapping community detection, and the results are shown in Table 6. As there is no overlapping ground-truth information of all these networks, we use EQ to evaluate the algorithms. Given the community number, we find that OCSBM can get high-quality community division in the labeled networks. However, the method is unsatisfactory in the networks without prior community information. We can see that LINSIA detects better results than OCSBM in most of the networks. Below we analyze the Polblog network in detail and give a graphical display. This network is derived from the links between weblogs about US politics published around the time of the 2004 presidential election. The links between weblogs were automatically extracted from a crawl of the front page of the weblog. Each blog is labeled with '0' or '1' to indicate whether they are "liberal" or "conservative". LINSIA groups these weblogs into two categories, which well represent the corresponding liberal and conservative weblogs respectively.

(4) Hierarchical and overlapping community detection

As shown in Table 7, we compare LINSIA with EAGLE for hierarchical and overlapping community detection. As there is no overlapping ground-truths, we compute the average EQ of the overlapping communities to measure the quality of the detected hierarchical community structures of the networks. Meanwhile, we use the number of the macro communities at the high level of the hierarchical structures as a evaluation metric. From Table 7, we can see that LINSIA shows a clear advantage over EAGLE based on the average EQ. Moreover, the community structure detected by EAGLE tends to have a large number of communities with small size. The reason is that EAGLE is a maximum cliques based method. As real-world networks are generally sparse, most of the maximum cliques detected by EAGLE only have several nodes.

Dolphins network is an undirected social network representing frequent associations between 62 dolphins in a community living off Doubtful Sound, New Zealand, and the hierarchical community structure detected by LINSIA of the Dolphins network is shown in Fig. 6. Fig. 6(a) represents the overlapping communities at the high level, and Fig. 6(b) represents the overlapping communities at the low level. According to Fig. 6, we can find that the hierarchical relationship between the overlapping communities. According to [31], we can conclude that LINSIA can detect almost the real communities of the network. Furthermore, schematic network is a clique dominated network which is used for performance evaluation of EAGLE in [24]. For the performance comparison of LINSIA against EAGLE, we apply LINSIA on the network, and the overlapping communities and the hierarchical relationship between them are shown in Fig. 7. The community with blue color in Fig. 7(a) includes the community with green color and the community with blue color in Fig. 7(b). According to the network topology, we can conclude that the result is reasonable. Meanwhile, the community division found by LINSIA is identical with the result detected by EAGLE in [24]. Thus we can conclude that EAGLE performs well on clique dominated networks, and LINSIA can detect rational overlapping and hierarchical communities on multiple types of networks.

Table 7. The performance of different algorithms for hierarchical and overlapping community detection.

Algorithm	Karate	Dolphins	Football	Polblog	Cond	Enron	Facebook	Flicker
	#C of the macroscopical division, Average EQ				#C of the macroscopical division, Average EQ			
EAGLE	7, 0.2195	8, 0.3084	13, 0.6798	8, 0.4011	1784, 0.7448	1316, 0.2141	1532, 0.1032	2522, 0.1721
LINSIA	**2, 0.3652**	**2, 0.3308**	**10, 0.5944**	**2, 0.4223**	**866, 0.7805**	**2644, 0.3734**	**965, 0.4142**	**121, 0.6823**



(a) EQ=0.3314, C=2. (b) EQ=0.3301, C=3.

Fig. 6. Result of LINSIA on Dolphins network.



(a) EQ=0.4986, C=3. (b) EQ=0.4801, C=4.

Fig. 7. Result of LINSIA on schematic network.

(5) Hubs and outliers identification

Given that there is no universal standard for hubs and outliers evaluation, the capability of LINSIA on hubs and outliers identification is evaluated based on result analysis.

To evaluate LINSIA's effectiveness on hubs detection, we apply it on three real-world networks. One of the networks is the Dolphins network. The hubs of the Dolphins network detected by LINSIA are shown as red nodes in Fig. 6. Considering the network structure and community division comprehensively, we can conclude that the detected hubs are rational. Furthermore, we apply LINSIA on the Polblog network in Fig. 5 and the schematic network in Fig. 7. We can conclude that the detected hubs in red color are also reasonable.

In addition, LINSIA has the advantage of soft-partitioning solution, and it can depict the degree of hubs belonging to each relevant community. For example, in the Dolphins network, the participation intensity set of the hubs in Fig. 6(a) is: {1:[(57, 0.746), (51, 0.253)], 7: [(57, 0.501), (51, 0.499)], 19: [(57, 0.5708), (51, 0.429)], 32: [(32, 0.600), (57, 0.399)], 39: [(57, 0.428), (51, 0.572)]}. Take the hub node 39 in the participation intensity set for example, the item means that node 39 belongs to the community labeled by 57 (in blue color) with degree 0.428 and belongs to the community labeled by 51 (in yellow color) with degree 0.572.

LINSIA's capability on outliers identification can also be demonstrated by the results of the Polblog network in Fig. 5 and the Dolphins network in Fig. 6. In the results, the outliers in Fig. 5 (in green color) and the outliers in Fig. 6 (in pink color) are rational according to the network topology. The reason is that our algorithm proposes a

new label updating strategy to make the periphery nodes have opportunity to compete with the core nodes in label selection process. For example, in Fig. 6(a), firstly outlier node 60 selects node 32's label as its community label. Then node 32 acts as an overlapping node after weighting the label influence of neighbor nodes. In this way, node 60 can exist with its local label information, instead of being overwhelmed by core nodes' labels. So our algorithm can find rational outliers efficiently.

In total, the experiments on all real-world networks demonstrate that LINSIA not only allows for extracting good complex communities in terms of the internal measures (Q and EQ) and external measures (NMI and ENMI), but also can identify reasonable hubs and outliers.

5.3. Running time



Fig. 8. Running times comparison. (a) The running times of algorithms for non-overlapping and non-hierarchical community detection. (b) The running times of algorithms for hierarchical community detection. (c) The running times of algorithms for overlapping community detection. (d) The running times of algorithms for overlapping and hierarchical community detection.

To assess and evaluate the scalability of LINSIA with respect to network size, we compare the running times of LINSIA as well as the comparison algorithms on the real-world networks listed in Table 3. Fig. 8 shows the running times of the different community detection algorithms. We can observe that LINSIA is faster than the other methods except Louvain and OCSBM. Although Louvain and OCSBM are faster than LINSIA, Louvain focuses only on hierarchical community detection, and OCSBM focuses only on overlapping community detection and requires prior community number for sufficiently good performance. By contrast, LINSIA is not only applicable to community detection, but also can identify hubs and outliers. In addition, we can find that LINSIA can process the networks with hundreds of thousands of nodes within two hours. So for the comprehensive complex network structure analysis, our algorithm LINSIA performs well in term of running time.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

Network structure analysis has always been an important research topic. Though many related researches have been done, most of them focus only on one of the structural features. The problem of investigating network structure comprehensively is very important, with many potential applications in real-world networks. However, little has been down in this research direction. In this paper, we have proposed an integrated network structure investigation algorithm LINSIA. The proposed algorithm outperforms several representative network structure analysis algorithms. However, we are still far away from thoroughly understanding the structure of complex networks, and some more issues still remain open. In this paper, the method focuses only on structural aspect. Besides structure, there are many dynamical processes on complex networks such as synchronization [38]. We hope the method and results in this paper can inspire some network structure analysis methods taking the network dynamics under consideration.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported partially by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 61202255), University-Industry Cooperation Projects of Guangdong Province (Grant No. 2012A090300001) and the Pre-research Project (Grant No. 51306050102). We thank Tao Zhou and JunMing Shao for their advices. We also thank Xin Li, Yunpeng Xiao, Xingping Xian and Yuanping Zhang for enlightening discussions and careful reading of the manuscript. The authors also wish to thank the anonymous reviewers for their thorough review and highly appreciate their useful comments and suggestions.

References

[1] M. Girvan, M. E. J. Newman, *"Community structure in social and biological networks"*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 99 (2002) 7821C7826.

[2] M. Girvan, M. E. J. Newman, *"Finding and evaluating community structure in networks"*, Phys. Rev. E 69 (2004) 026113.

[3] M. E. J. Newman, *"Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks"*, Phys. Rev. E 69 (2004) 066133.

[4] M. E. J. Newman, *"Modularity and community structure in networks"*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 103 (2006) 8577-8582.

[5] J. Yang, J. Leskovec, *"Overlapping community detection at scale: a nonnegative matrix factorization approach"*, WSDM' 13, pp. 587-596.

[6] M. E. J. Newman, *"Spectral methods for network community detection and graph partitioning"*, Phys. Rev. E 88 (2013) 042822.

[7] U. N. Raghavan, R. Albert, S. Kumara, *"Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks"*, Phys. Rev. E 76 (2007) 036106.

[8] Y. Xing, F.R. Meng, Y. Zhou, *"A Node Influence Based Label Propagation Algorithm for Community Detection in Networks"*, The Sci. World J. 2014 (2014) 627581.

[9] M. E. J. Newman, E. Leicht, *"Mixture models and exploratory analysis in networks"*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 104 (2007) 9564-9569.

[10] Brian Karrer, M. E. J. Newman, *"Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks"*, Phys. Rev. E 83 (2011) 016107.

[11] Zh. Q. Xu, Y. P. Ke, Y. Wang, *"A Fast Inference Algorithm for Stochastic Blockmodel"*, ICDM'14, pp. 620-629.

[12] V. D. Blondel, J. L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, E. Lefebvre, *"Fast unfolding of communities in large networks"*, J. Stat. Mech. (2008) P10008.

[13] J. Huang, H. Sun, J. Han, H. Deng, Y. Sun, *"SHRINK: A Structural Clustering Algorithm for Detecting Hierarchical Communities in Networks"*, CIKM'10, pp. 219-228.

[14] M. Sales-Pardo, R. Guimera, A. A. Moreira, L. A. Amaral, *"Extracting the hierarchical organization of complex systems"*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 104 (2007) 15224-15229.

[15] S. Gregory, *"Finding overlapping communities in networks by label propagation"*, New J. Phys. 12 (2010) 103018.

[16] G. Palla, I. Derenyi, I. Farkas, T. Vicsek, *"Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society"*, Nature 435 (2005) 814-818.

[17] J. R. Xie, B. K. Szymanski, X. M. Liu, *"Slpa: Uncovering Overlapping Communities in Social Networks via a Speaker-Listener Interaction Dynamic Process"*, ICDMW'11, pp. 344-349.

[18] D. Chen, M. Shang, Z. Lv, Y. Fu, *"Detecting overlapping communities of weighted networks via a local algorithm"*, Physica A 389 (2010) 4177-4187.

[19] Y. Z. Cui, X. Y. Wang, J. Q. Li, *"Detecting overlapping communities in networks using the maximal sub-graph and the clustering coefficient"*, Phys. A 405 (2014) 85-91.

[20] P. K. Gopalan, D. M. Blei, *"Efficient discovery of overlapping communities in massive networks"*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 110 (2013) 14534-14539.

[21] B. J. Sun, H. W. Shen, X. Q. Cheng, *"Detecting overlapping communities in massive networks"*, EPL. 108 (2014) 68001.

[22] B. Ball, B. Karrer, M. E. J. Newman, *"Efficient and principled method for detecting communities in networks"*, Phys. Rev. E 84 (2011) 036103.

[23] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, J. Kertesz, *"Detecting the overlapping and hierarchical community structure of complex networks"*, New J. Phys. 11 (2009) 033015.

[24] H. Shen, X. Cheng, K. Cai, M.B. Hu, *"Detect overlapping and hierarchical community structure in networks"*, Phys. A 388 (2009) 1706-1712.

[25] F. Havemann, J. Glaser, M. Heinz, M. Struck, *"Identifying Overlapping and Hierarchical Thematic Structures in Networks of Scholarly Papers: A Comparison of Three Approaches"*, PLoS ONE 7 (2012) e33255.

[26] J. Bae, S. Kim, *"Identifying and ranking influential spreaders in complex networks by neighborhood coreness"*, Phys. A 395 (2014) 549-559.

[27] M. Kitsak, L. K. Gallos, S. Havlin, F. Liljeros, L. Muchnik, H. E. Stanley, H. A. Makse, *"Identification of influential spreaders in complex networks"*, Nature Phys. 6 (2010) 888-893.

[28] A. Strehl, J. Ghosh, *"Cluster ensemblesa knowledge reuse framework for combining multiple partitions"*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research 3 (2003) 583-617.

[29] A. McDaid, D. Greene, and N. Hurley, *"Normalized Mutual Information to evaluate overlapping community finding algorithms"*, CoRR (2011) abs/1110.2515

[30] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, F. Radicchi, *"Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms."*, Phys. Rev. E 78 (2008) 046110.

[31] W. W. Zachary, *"An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups"*, J. Anthro. Res. (1977) 452-473.

[32] D. Lusseau, *"The emergent properties of dolphin social network"*, Proc. Biol. Sci. 270 (2003) 186-188.

[33] Lada A. Adamic, Natalie Glance, *"The political blogosphere and the 2004 U.S. election: divided they blog"*, LinkKDD '05, pp. 36-43.

[34] M. E. J. Newman, *"The structure of scientific collaboration networks"*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 98 (2001) 404-409.

[35] J. Leskovec, K. Lang, A. Dasgupta, M. Mahoney, *"Community Structure in Large Networks: Natural Cluster Sizes and the Absence of Large Well-Defined Clusters"*, Internet Mathematics, 6 (2009) 29-123.

[36] B. Viswanath, *"On the Evolution of User Interaction in Facebook"*, WOSN'09, pp. 37-42.

[37] J. McAuley, J. Leskovec, *"Image Labeling on a Network: Using Social-Network Meta data for Image Classification"*, ECCV14, pp. 828-841.

[38] M. Y. Zhou, Z. Zhuo, S. M. Cai, Z. Q. Fu, *"Community structure revealed by phase locking"*, Chaos 24 (2014) 033128.